until 30 days after the date on which the Secretary of Energy provides to the congressional defense committees written recommendations regarding whether and in what manner the Program should proceed.

(2) The recommendations submitted under paragraph (1) shall include—

(A) a description of the disposition method the Government of Russia has agreed to use;

(B) a description of the assistance the United States Government plans to provide under the Program;

(C) an estimate of the total cost and schedule of such assistance;

(D) an explanation of how parallelism is to be defined for purposes of the Program and whether such parallelism can be achieved if the United States mixed-oxide (MOX) plutonium disposition program continues on the current planned schedule without further delays.

(b) EXCEPTION.—The limitation under subsection (a) does not apply to the obligation of funds to continue research and development associated with the Gas Turbine-Modular Helium Reactor (GT–MHR).

SEC. 3119. LIMITATION ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF MOX FUEL FABRICATION FACILITY.

None of the amount authorized to be appropriated under section 3101(a)(2) for defense nuclear nonproliferation activities may be obligated for construction project 99–D–143, the Mixed-Oxide (MOX) Fuel Fabrication Facility, until 30 days after the date on which the Secretary of Energy provides to the congressional defense committees—

(1) an independent cost estimate for the United States Surplus Fissile Materials Disposition Program and facilities; and

(2) a written certification that the Department of Energy intends to use the MOX Fuel Fabrication Facility for United States plutonium disposition regardless of the future direction of the Russian Surplus Fissile Materials Disposition Program.

SEC. 3120. TECHNICAL CORRECTION RELATED TO AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2006.

Effective as of January 6, 2006, and as if included therein as enacted, section 3101(a) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163; 119 Stat. 3537) is amended by striking ''$9,196,456'' and inserting ''$9,196,456,000''.

SEC. 3121. EDUCATION OF FUTURE NUCLEAR ENGINEERS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The Department of Defense and the United States depend on the specialized expertise of nuclear engineers who support the development and sustainment of technologies including naval reactors, strategic weapons, and nuclear power plants.

(2) Experts estimate that over 25 percent of the approximately 58,000 workers in the nuclear power industry in the United States will be eligible to retire within 5 years, representing both a huge loss of institutional memory and a potential national security crisis.

(3) This shortfall of workers is exacerbated by reductions to the University Reactor Infrastructure and Education Assistance program, which trains civilian nuclear scientists and engineers. The defense and civilian nuclear industries are interdependent on a limited number of educational institutions to produce their workforce. A reduction in nuclear scientists and engineers trained in the civilian sector may result in a further loss of qualified personnel for defense-related research and engineering.

(4) The Department of Defense's successful Science, Math and Research for Transformation (SMART) scholarship-for-service program serves as a good model for a targeted scholarship or fellowship program designed to educate future scientists at the postsecondary and postgraduate levels.

(b) REPORT ON EDUCATION OF FUTURE NUCLEAR ENGINEERS.—

(1) STUDY.—The Secretary of Energy shall study the feasibility and merit of establishing a targeted scholarship or fellowship program to educate future nuclear engineers at the postsecondary and postgraduate levels.

(2) REPORT REQUIRED.—The President shall submit to the congressional defense committees, together with the budget request submitted for fiscal year 2008, a report on the study conducted by the Secretary of Energy under paragraph (1).

TITLE XXXII—DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD

SEC. 3201. AUTHORIZATION.

There are authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2007, $22,260,000 for the operation of the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board under chapter 21 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2286 et seq.).

TITLE XXXIII—NATIONAL DEFENSE STOCKPILE

SEC. 3301. TRANSFER OF GOVERNMENT-FURNISHED URANIUM STORED AT SEQUOYAH FUELS CORPORATION, GORE, OKLAHOMA.

(a) TRANSPORT AND DISPOSAL.—Not later than March 31, 2007, the Secretary of the Army shall, subject to subsection (c), transport to an authorized disposal facility for appropriate disposal all of the Federal Government-furnished uranium in the chemical and physical form in which it is stored at the Sequoyah Fuels Corporation site in Gore, Oklahoma.

(b) SOURCE OF FUNDS.—Funds authorized to be appropriated by section 301(1) for the Army for operation and maintenance may be used for the transport and disposal required under subsection (a).

(c) LIABILITY.—The Secretary may only transport uranium under subsection (a) after receiving from Sequoyah Fuels Corporation a written agreement satisfactory to the Secretary that provides that—

(1) the United States assumes no liability, legal or otherwise, of Sequoyah Fuels Corporation by transporting such uranium; and

(2) the Sequoyah Fuels Corporation waives any and all claims it may have against the United States related to the transported uranium.

TITLE XXXIV—NAVAL PETROLEUM RESERVES

SEC. 3401. COMPLETION OF EQUITY FINALIZATION PROCESS FOR NAVAL PETROLEUM RESERVE NUMBERED 1.

Section 3412(g) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 (Public Law 104–106; 10 U.S.C. 7420 note) is amended—

(1) by inserting ''(1)'' after ''(g)''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(2)(A) In light of the unique role that the independent petroleum engineer who is retained pursuant to paragraph (b)(2) performs in the process of finalizing equity interests, and the importance to the United States taxpayer of timely completion of the equity finalization process, the independent petroleum engineer's 'Shallow Oil Zone Provisional Recommendation of Equity Participation,' which was presented to the equity finalization teams for the Department of Energy and Chevron U.S.A. Inc. on October 1 and 2, 2002, shall become the final equity recommendation of the independent petroleum engineer, as that term is used in the Protocol on NPR–1 Equity Finalization Implementation Process, July 8, 1996, for the Shallow Oil Zone unless the Department of Energy and Chevron U.S.A. Inc. agree in writing not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this paragraph that the independent petroleum engineer shall not be liable to either party for any cost or expense incurred or for any loss or damage sustained—

''(i) as a result of the manner in which services are performed by the independent petroleum engineer in accordance with its contract with the Department of Energy to support the equity determination process;

''(ii) as a result of the failure of the independent petroleum engineer in good faith to perform any service or make any determination or computation, unless caused by its gross negligence; or

''(iii) as a result of the reliance by either party on any computation, determination, estimate or evaluation made by the independent petroleum engineer unless caused by the its gross negligence or willful misconduct.

''(B) If Chevron U.S.A. Inc. agrees in writing not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this paragraph that the independent petroleum engineer shall not be liable to Chevron U.S.A. Inc. or the Department of Energy for any cost or expense incurred or for any loss or damage described in clauses (i) through (iii) of subparagraph (A), the Department of Energy shall agree to the same not later than such date.''.

Mr. ALLEN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CORNYN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. LANDRIEU. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Ms. LANDRIEU pertaining to the introduction of S. 3626 are located in today's RECORD under ''Statements of Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—H.R. 810, S. 2754, S. 3504

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at a time determined by the majority leader, after consultation with the Democratic leader, the Senate proceed en bloc to the following bills under the following agreement:

H.R. 810, Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act, discharged from the HELP Committee; S. 2754, Alternative Pluripotent Stem Cell Therapies Enhancement Act, discharged from the HELP Committee; S. 3504, Fetus Farming Prohibition Act of 2006.

I further ask consent there be a total of 12 hours of debate equally divided between the two leaders or their designees; provided further that no amendments be in order to any of the measures; further, that following the use or yielding back of time the bills be read a third time and the Senate proceed to three consecutive votes in the following order with no intervening action or debate: S. 3504, S. 2754, H.R. 810.

Finally, I ask unanimous consent that any bill that does not receive 60 votes in the affirmative, the vote on passage be vitiated and the bill be returned to its previous status on the calendar or in the HELP Committee; and further, other than as provided in this agreement, it not be in order for the Senate to consider any bill or amendment relating to stem cell research during the remainder of the 109th Congress.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, it is my understanding that if any one of these three bills or all of them receive 60 votes, they would be passed.

Mr. FRIST. That is correct. Each of these bills will have a 60-vote threshold.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, let me say, first of all, that I extend my appreciation to the distinguished majority leader. This has been difficult. I know that. I would rather that we would just be going forward with H.R. 810, but we will take what we have.

I think this bill is going to be bring peace and comfort to Nancy Reagan and many people just like Nancy Reagan who believe that what we are going to do next month, I hope—is that right?

Mr. FRIST. In all likelihood, but at some mutually agreeable time.

Mr. REID. Will be something that will give comfort to Nancy Reagan and people like her about treatment and maybe cures which can come from some of these dread diseases.

I think it is an important day for the Senate.

Again, I tell the leader how much I appreciate this and I speak for every Democrat and I speak for people throughout the country. I know this has not been easy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. No objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I thank the Democratic leader. As he knows, we have been working a long time to bring, in an appropriate fashion, these bills to the floor. The unanimous consent agreement that we just obtained says that we will address three bills—I will have more to say about those shortly—over the course of the 12-hour period and then have the 60-vote threshold on each of those.

It was several weeks ago that I reiterated my commitment to work with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to bring the debate about Federal funding for stem cell research to the Senate floor. We have been working very hard in meeting after meeting to do just that.

I just propounded a unanimous consent request which was agreed to that had three pieces of legislation—the Alternative Pluripotent Stem Cell Therapies Enhancement Act, the Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act, which is H.R. 810, and the Fetus Farming Prohibition Act of 2006.

I will have a little bit more to say about each of these.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I will be very quick because I know the leader has things to do.

In entering this agreement, which we have just done, I am relying on the leader's good faith—basically his word and reputation—that we will do this before we get out of here by the October break. Is that his intention?

Mr. FRIST. It is my intention, as it is worded in here, that the two of us will agree upon a time. It is my intention after getting over this first hurdle to do this in the not too distant future before we leave.

Mr. REID. I hope we can arrive at a time and agree that we can get this done.

Mr. FRIST. We will.

Mr. President, I would like to comment a little bit on the approach and the rationale behind these bills which have been a long time in coming. This is a very similar to the approach that we tried about a year ago, but because of timing and a whole host of reasons we couldn't get a unanimous consent agreement. So I am pleased that we are there.

I am pro-life. I personally believe that human life begins at conception in large part because it is the moment that the organism is complete—immature, yes, but complete.

An embryo is nascent human life. It is genetically distinct as that individual; it is biologically human; it is living. This position is consistent with my faith. But to me it isn't just a matter of faith; it is a matter of science.

Our development is this continuous process; it is gradual; it is chronological; and at one point in time all of us in this room were embryos. That embryo is human life at that very earliest stage of development, which is continuous, which again is chronological over time. And accordingly, that embryo has more significance, it has more moral value, and thus it deserves our utmost respect and dignity.

I also believe, as do other scientists—I would say countless other scientists, clinicians, and doctors—that all stem cells, but specifically embryonic stem cells, hold a very specific, unique promise for some therapies and potential cures: diabetes, Parkinson's disease, Alzheimer's, Lou Gehrig's disease, and spinal cord injuries. Stem cells offer hope for treatment that other lines of research simply haven't offered.

Embryonic stem cells are what we call ''pluripotent,'' adult stem cells. You have embryonic stem cells, and these embryonic stem cells are ''pluripotential.'' What that means is that they have two remarkable qualities that really no other cell in the human body has. That is why they are so unique. The embryonic stem cells have the capacity to become any other type of tissue that is unique to them.

Second, they have this remarkable capacity of being able to renew themselves—copy themselves again and again and again and again indefinitely.

It is those two properties, the ability to copy itself over time and to become any sort of tissue, which makes it specifically unique and so remarkable. That is why we have so much potential hope for cure and for therapy.

Right now, there is the challenge; there is the ethical challenge. This is why it is so hard for us and for people all across this country as they listen to the debate; that is, to derive these embryonic stem cells using the technology that we know today. The embryo itself has to be altered in some way or destroyed.

That is the heart of the ethical concern. That is why I have made it clear that while I strongly support Federal funding for embryonic stem cell research, that Federal funding should only be provided within a system, a comprehensive system of ethical oversight, strict safeguards in this ethical system that are overseeing this financial investment. That comprehensive oversight has to have strict safeguards and public accountability. It has to have complete transparency so we ensure that this new research, this evolving research unfolds over time within accepted ethical bounds.

It is interesting. I came to this floor about 5 years ago. It was 5 years ago sometime around either June or July. At that time, I laid out a comprehensive proposal to promote stem cell research within this ethical framework.

That is interesting because I talked about adult stem cells and embryonic stem cells. At that point in time, embryonic stem cells were only 3 years old in terms of discovery. They had been around a long time, but we only discovered them really in about 1998. At that point in time, I proposed 10 specific interdependent principles.

At this juncture, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD those principles.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FRIST PRINCIPLES ON HUMAN STEM CELL RESEARCH

Stem cell research holds tremendous potential for treating serious illness and disease. Because the embryonic stem cells derived from five to six day-old blastocysts are ''pluripotent'' (appearing capable of indefinite self-renewal and differentiation into all cell types), research conducted with embryonic stem cells derived from the roughly 20–30 cells contained in the inner cell mass of the blastocyst has the potential to help advance treatments for diabetes, Alzheimer's disease, Parkinson's disease, leukemia, spinal cord injuries and a number of other diseases and conditions. Research using adult stem cells also holds great promise, although there may be characteristics of adult stem cells that limit the medical potential of this research.

Embryonic stem cell research—and the derivation of stem cells from blastocysts—raises significant ethical and moral questions. Many believe that these days-old embryos are human life and should not be used for research purposes under any circumstance. Others believe that, because such

embryos exist outside the womb at this early developmental stage, they are not yet life. Still others believe that, regardless of whether such embryos are life, the potential of embryonic stem cells should outweigh moral or ethical concerns about their use for potentially life-saving research.

These competing concerns make it extremely difficult to reach consensus on a federal policy in this area. Nonetheless, because both embryonic and adult stem cell research may contribute to significant medical and health advancement, research on both should be federally funded within a carefully regulated, fully transparent framework that ensures respect for the moral significance of the human embryo.

The unique interplay of this promising but uncharted new science with the ethical and moral considerations of life, disease and health is continually evolving and presenting new challenges. Therefore, we must ensure a strong, comprehensive, publicly accountable oversight structure that is responsive on an ongoing basis to moral, social and scientific considerations.

Federal funding for stem cell research should be contingent on the implementation of strict new safeguards and public accountability governing this new, evolving research. The following 10 points are essential components of a comprehensive framework that allows stem cell research to progress in a manner respectful of both the moral significance of human embryos and the potential of stem cell research to improve health.

1. Ban Embryo Creation for Research: The creation of human embryos solely for research purposes should be strictly prohibited.

2. Continue Funding Ban on Derivation: Strengthen and codify the current ban on federal funding for the derivation of embryonic stem cells.

3. Ban Human Cloning: Prohibit all human cloning to prevent the creation and exploitation of life for research purposes.

4. Increase Adult Stem Cell Research Funding: Increase federal funding for research on adult stem cells to ensure the pursuit of all promising areas of stem cell research.

5. Provide Funding for Embryonic Stem Cell Research Only From Blastocysts That Would Otherwise Be Discarded: Allow federal funding for research using only those embryonic stem cells derived from blastocysts that are left over after in vitro fertilization (IVF) and would otherwise be discarded.

6. Require a Rigorous Informed Consent Process: To ensure that blastocysts used for stem cell research are only those that would otherwise be discarded, require a comprehensive informed consent process establishing a clear separation between potential donors' primary decision to donate blastocysts for adoption or to discard blastocysts and their subsequent option to donate blastocysts for research purposes. Such a process, modeled in part on well-established and broadly accepted organ and tissue donation practices, will ensure that donors are fully informed of all their options.

7. Limit Number of Stem Cell Lines: Restrict federally-funded research using embryonic stem cells derived from blastocysts to a limited number of cell lines. In addition, authorize federal funding for embryonic stem stem cell research for five years to ensure ongoing Congressional oversight.

8. Establish A Strong Public Research Oversight System: Establish appropriate public oversight mechanisms, including a national research registry, to ensure the transparent, in-depth monitoring of federally-funded and federally-regulated stem cell research and to promote ethical, high quality research standards.

9. Require Ongoing, Independent Scientific and Ethical Review: Establish an ongoing scientific review of stem cell research by the Institute of Medicine (IOM) and create an independent Presidential advisory panel to monitor evolving bioethical issues in the area of stem cell research. In addition, require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to report to Congress annually on the status of federal grants for stem cell research, the number of stem cell lines created, the results of stem cell research, the number of grant applications received and awarded, and the amount of federal funding provided.

10. Strengthen and Harmonize Fetal Tissue Research Restrictions: Because stem cell research would be subject to new, stringent federal requirements, ensure that informed consent and oversight regulations applicable to federally-funded fetal tissue research are consistent with these new rules.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I also said at the time that policymakers and the public must often reassess the research, this new research, this evolving research and the circumstances under which it is conducted.

As I said then—and I believe now—we must do all we can to pursue promising alternative strategies that hold the same potential, the potential for developing the pluripotent stem cell lines without damaging the embryo, without altering the embryo, without destroying the embryo or nascent human life.

Shortly after that time—that was 5 years ago—the President announced his policy for embryonic stem cell research. That was remarkable at the time. I think it was August 11. It was Federally funded embryonic stem cell research for the first time ever. It did so within that ethical framework. It showed respect for human life.

That is why I believe it is important for us to have this debate on the floor of the Senate.

The policy also restricted the embryonic stem cell funding only to those stem cell lines that had been derived prior to his announcement. That was the cutoff line. At that time it was widely believed that there were 78 such embryonic stem cell lines that would be available for Federal funding; 78 we thought at the time when President put forth his proposal. Unfortunately, over time we have learned that had not been the case. What we thought would have been 78 lines today we realize only became 22 cell lines—22 lines—that are eligible.

Moreover, those lines unexpectedly—we didn't know it at the time. That is why it is so important to constantly come back and modify, if necessary, but reevaluate policies. Those lines unexpectedly after several generations are starting to became less stable and less replicative than we had initially anticipated.

Science is fascinating. Just as an aside, they seem to be acquiring and losing chromosomes. They are losing what we call the normal carrier type. They are potentially losing growth control, all of which means these cell lines out there are less useful in terms of research, in terms of opening up that potential, those possibilities, that hope for cures.

Also, another complication which we didn't realize at the time—some scientists did but we didn't know what the impact would be—all of these cell lines were grown on mouse-feeder cells, which we have learned since will limit their future potential for using those clinically or in clinical therapy in humans. There are concerns, for example, about viral contamination.

These are limitations we didn't realize at the time but we do know today, 5 years later.

While embryonic stem cell research is still in the very early stage, we have to be careful not to over-promise. And when people look at these bills coming through, although we want to open up that possibility for hope, we cannot over-promise.

The limitations we put in place in 2001 will over time show our ability to investigate new treatments for certain diseases—the mouse-feeder cells, the changes that we are seeing in the initial cell lines, the fact that there are fewer cells lines.

Therefore, I think it is the responsible thing for us to do, to come to the floor and consider modifying that policy, updating that policy based on what we have learned, which is why, with reservation, I support the House-passed embryonic stem cell research bill, H.R. 810.

Let me be clear on this particular bill. Because again and again people come forward saying there are so many deficiencies in the bill. And I see deficiencies in the bill. If circumstances were different, I would seek to ensure that a much stronger ethical and scientific oversight mechanism be in place, which is not part of that particular bill. Things like a clear prohibition on financial or other incentives between science and fertility clinics, more explicit requirements around informed consent, all of which is not in that particular bill.

But I have said that we should debate and vote on that House-passed bill. I, thus, have asked that it be included in the package of bills that we put forward for consideration on which we just got by unanimous consent agreement to debate and vote.

Moreover, as we consider embryonic stem cell research, we shouldn't diminish in any way the promise or slow the progress of research on adult stem cells or cells that have pluripotential capability but aren't strictly embryonic stem cells.

To date, adult stem cell research is the only type of stem cell research that is actively used in humans for treatment, for therapy, to cure diseases.

As a transplant surgeon—I transplant hearts and lungs—today we can transplant these adult stem cells. It is lifesaving. It has saved the lives of thousands and thousands of people. Part of that is that we have much longer experience with adult stem cells. We have probably three decades of experience

with the adult stem cells. We only have about 8 years of experience with the embryonic stem cells.

With more Federal support and emphasis, newer methods of deriving the pluripotential cells are being developed and have proven themselves in animal models—not yet in humans—fully developed, and we need to continue to support that research. It will have huge scientific and clinical payoffs.

Just as important, they may bridge the moral and ethical differences among people who now hold very different views on stem cell research because these newer alternative methods avoid the destruction of any human embryos. It is these forms of research which may offer not only a way forward to these new treatments and these new cures but also a way out of these ethical dilemmas posed by other forms of research.

That is why in this package I asked the Senate to also continue legislation to enhance this support for alternatives to embryonic stem cell research. I am very pleased that Senators SANTORUM and SPECTER have joined together and crafted the Alternative Pluripotent Stem Cell Therapies Enhancement Act, S. 2754, which is similar to legislation I worked on with a number of our colleagues—most specifically Senator ISAKSON from Georgia—last year. I do encourage every Senator to support these new alternative ways of reaching pluripotency in cells. It is very exciting research. There is no reason this legislation should not truly unite us as a body and be something everyone can support.

The third bill that has been included in this unanimous consent request is the Fetus Farming Prohibition Act of 2006, S. 3504. One may ask, what is fetus farming? It is the implantation and gestation of an embryo in a human or animal for the purpose of aborting for research. As far as I am aware, fetus farming is not a method that is currently employed but a method that has been proposed. It is not out of the realm of possibility. Therefore, Senators BROWNBACK and SANTORUM have proposed legislation which would draw a clear line which should not be crossed.

Those are the three bills which we will be debating. Several of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have come to the Senate over the last several weeks and months to suggest we take up H.R. 810 or that we immediately take it up. However, I am absolutely convinced that all three bills I have mentioned address the profound ethical questions surrounding the promise of stem cells, the hope that these stem cells will lead to cure and therapy. That is why I believe it is only fair on an issue of this magnitude that Senators be given the courtesy and respect of addressing all three of these very different ideas, these areas which are surrounded in some ethical concern but also are important to medicine, science, and health.

The other proposals for handling this include taking a bill out and seeing what happens. Because these bills are so complex and Members have so many potential amendments, we have taken this course of having 3 bills with the 60-vote thresholds.

I thank my colleagues. We covered the spectrum. It has actually taken several months to pull together this unanimous consent request and agreement. I am very pleased we now have a process in place, the timing of which we can determine or I will determine in consultation with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I support the unanimous consent agreement on stem cell research legislation propounded by our majority leader, Senator FRIST.

Overall, this is a fair proposal and it is certainly a matter that this Senate should be prepared to debate and vote upon as soon as possible.

It is over a year since the House of Representatives acted in a bipartisan fashion to adopt legislation, H.R. 810 that would increase the number of stem cell lines eligible for Federal funding if those stem cell lines were derived from embryos no longer needed for in vitro fertilization.

This is a good bill that Senators SPECTER and HARKIN have urged on this body since 2001. It is time to debate and vote upon this proposal.

The unanimous consent agreement also accommodates the interests of other Senators by including two other bills in this package.

I believe I can support these other two measures which are designed to outlaw so-called fetal farming and to encourage alterative means of devising new stem cell lines.

While I do not think that the alternative measure can or should be thought of as a replacement for the new cell lines that will be derived if H.R. 810 is passed, I am supportive of this type of research.

The stem cell issue is ripe for debate and resolution and I think that this unanimous consent agreement will move us down the road in a constructive fashion.

While this unanimous consent agreement does not address the issue of cloning, or somatic cell research as it is known in the language of science, we will have ample time to debate these matters in the future. And as much as Senator FEINSTEIN and I and others would like to debate and vote on our bill to ban reproductive cloning and to erect ethical safeguards to govern therapeutic cloning that advances the science of regenerative medicine, we can agree to have this somewhat different debate on a different day.

It is time for the Senate to vote on the Castle-DeGette bill that passed the House last year. Scientists tell us that there is great advantage to expanding the number of stem cell lines eligible for Federal funding.

Here is what one Nobel Laureate, Paul Berg of Stanford University, has said about the importance of passing this legislation:

DEAR SENATOR FEINSTEIN,

The Senate will shortly be considering legislation to permit the National Institutes of Health (NIH) to fund research with additional and new and existing human embryonic stem cell (hESC) lines. As a staunch supporter of biomedical research and particularly research with hESCs, I trust that you will exert your influence to ensure passage of H.R 810. Scientists engaged in ESC research are counting on you and like-minded Senate colleagues to assure its passage. The President must also be persuaded not to veto this legislation for if we continue on the path he set five years ago United States investigators will be out of the running in converting embryonic stem cells into important new therapies. It is especially frustrating and demeaning that American scientists are prohibited from using their NIH grant funds for research with the hundreds of hESC line generated outside the United States or generated in this country with private funding.

Paul Berg

When our Nobel Award winning scientists, like Dr. Berg, are telling us how important this research is, we should all pay careful attention.

Many among the American public agree that the time has come for the Senate to take up and pass the legislation that the House has already passed over a year ago.

Let me just share with you a letter that I received from Nancy Reagan on this important issue.

OFFICE OF NANCY REAGAN,
Los Angeles, CA, May 1, 2006.

HON. ORRIN HATCH,
Washington, DC.

DEAR ORRIN, Thank you for your continued commitment to helping the millions of Americans who suffer from devastating and disabling diseases. Your support has given so much hope to so many.

It has been nearly a year since the United States House of Representatives first approved the stem cell legislation that would open the research so we could fully unleash its promise. For those who are waiting every day for scientific progress to help their loved ones, the wait for United States Senate action has been very difficult and hard to comprehend.

I understand that the United States Senate is now considering voting on H.R. 810, the Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act, sometime this month. Orrin, I know I can count on friends like you to help make sure this happens. There is just no more time to wait.

Sincerely,

NANCY REAGAN.

I think that Mrs. Reagan has it exactly right.

We need to debate and vote on this issue and we need to do it now. That is what I understand that the unanimous consent agreement proposed by Senator FRIST will accomplish. I am pleased that all of my colleagues have agreed to this unanimous consent agreement.

This agreement is acceptable to some of the staunchest opponents of H.R. 810. For example, I do not think that anyone has been as outspoken in their opposition to H.R. 810 than my friend from Kansas, Senator BROWNBACK. But I understand that this unanimous consent agreement is acceptable to him.

Both Senator BROWNBACK and I—and many others—might have crafted a

slightly different unanimous consent agreement—but I think that most would agree that what is being proposed by Senator FRIST gives a fair series of votes that could be accomplished in a reasonable amount of floor time in a part of the year when floor time is becoming a precious quantity.

Stem cell research presents a great opportunity for scientists to gain knowledge that can help those families in America and around the world in which loved ones suffer from currently incurable diseases such as cancer, heart disease, Alzheimer's, diabetes and Parkinson's to name a few.

In order to develop a better understanding of the causes and cures of many diseases tomorrow, we must conduct a vigorous research program today.

And let me be clear, cures will not happen overnight or will come easily. We have years of hard work ahead of us. But we have much work to do today to bring about these future advances.

In my view, what this unanimous consent agreement does is to move the ball forward. I am pleased that no one appears to be objecting to this agreement so we can give this matter the debate and votes that it deserves.

The House has acted on an important bill and, in this case, I believe that the Senate should give the American people a simple, an up-or-down vote on this measure.

I think that each of these three bills can gain substantial majorities.

I support the unanimous consent agreement. I am prepared to vote and hope my colleagues will support this agreement that will allow us to debate and have votes in a manner that does not allow parliamentary tactics to unduly delay or otherwise obstruct debate on this important legislation.

This unanimous consent agreement is a step in the right direction and I look forward to the debate on these three bills which can benefit the American public so much down the road.

This is good news for individuals like young Cody Anderson of Utah, who suffers from juvenile diabetes. This is good news for many individuals.

I commend the majority leader and my colleagues for tonight's agreement on a way to move forward.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate immediately proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations on today's Executive Calendar: 613, 621, 738, 739, 740, 741, 742, 743, 744, 746 through 750, 752 through 758, 759, and all nominations on the Secretary's desk.

I further ask unanimous consent that the nominations be confirmed en bloc, the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and the Senate then return to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations considered and confirmed en bloc are as follows:

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

James B. Gulliford, of Missouri, to be Assistant Administrator for Toxic Substances of the Environmental Protection Agency.

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

Daniel L. Cooper, of Pennsylvania, to be Under Secretary for Benefits of the Department of Veterans Affairs for a term of four years.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Michael L. Dominguez, of Virginia, to be Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness, vice Charles S. Abell, resigned.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Maurice L. McFann, Jr., 0000

IN THE ARMY

The following named officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be brigadier general

Col. Frank A. Cipolla, 0000

The following named officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be brigadier general

Col. Michael J. Silva, 0000

IN THE NAVY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be vice admiral

Rear Adm. Robert B. Murrett, 0000

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be vice admiral

Rear Adm. Mark J. Edwards, 0000

LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION

Jonann E. Chiles, of Arkansas, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Legal Services Corporation for a term expiring July 13, 2008, vice Robert J. Dieter.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

John Clint Williamson, of Louisiana, to be Ambassador at Large for War Crimes Issues.

Gaddi H. Vasquez, of California, for the rank of Ambassador during his tenure of service as U.S. Representative to the United Nations Agencies for Food and Agriculture.

Michael E. Ranneberger, of Virginia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Kenya.

Robert D. McCallum, Jr., of Georgia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Australia.

Eric M. Bost, of Texas, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of South Africa.

Leslie V. Rowe, of Washington, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Papua New Guinea, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Solomon Islands and Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Vanuatu.

W. Stuart Symington IV, of Missouri, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Djibouti.

Gayleatha Beatrice Brown, of New Jersey, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Benin.

Peter R. Coneway, of Texas, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Switzerland, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Principality of Liechtenstein.

Clifford M. Sobel, of New Jersey, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Federative Republic of Brazil.

Robert O. Blake, Jr., of Maryland, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Democratic Socialist Republic of Sri Lanka, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Maldives.

Thomas C. Foley, of Connecticut, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Ireland.

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

Steven G. Preston, of Illinois, to be Administrator of the Small Business Administration.

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S DESK

IN THE ARMY

PN1676 ARMY nomination of Con G. Pham, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 14, 2006.

PN1677 ARMY nominations (7) beginning DARYL W. FRANCIS, and ending DWAINE M. TORGERSEN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 14, 2006.

PN1678 ARMY nominations (6) beginning BRIAN E. BISHOP, and ending ALAN C. SAUNDERS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 14, 2006.